

A PLEA
FOR
HUMANITY.

A SERMON

PREACHED IN THE

EUCLID STREET PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

CLEVELAND, OHIO,

BY

REV. J. B. BITTINGER.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

CLEVELAND:

MEDILL, COWLES & CO.'S PRESS—MORNING LEADER OFFICE.

1854.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

ADVERTISEMENT.

In complying, at this late date, with the renewed request of those who heard the following discourse, to yield it for publication ; it is but courteous to state the reasons why I at first declined giving it any further publicity.

The most conservative branch of our National Legislature had already, by an overwhelming majority, passed the bill ; and judging from the ill-disguised and unseemly eagerness which had characterized its passage through the Senate, that the House, by a parliamentary tactic of the "previous question," would consummate the deed, for the approval of which the Executive signature was impatient ; such publicity *then*, seemed to be altogether superfluous for good. But the Bill having been providentially arrested, and thus affording, at least, a precarious opportunity to the people, for considering its bearings on humanity and government morals, I *now* freely place the sermon at the disposal of those whose friendship I highly esteem, and to whose wishes I cheerfully accede, however much I may dissent from their flattering expectations concerning its influence. That it may do good, I as earnestly hope, as the petitioners confidently expect.

Lest the *imprimatur* should be interpreted too widely, I will add, that, with the exception of the notes and the paragraph containing the lines from Milton, the following discourse, as far as it could be restored from memory, after an interval of several weeks, is an integral copy of the MS. as first delivered.

Cleveland, Ohio, April 24, 1854.

THE KING AND THE PROPHET;

A FABLE FOR THE TIMES.

II KINGS, XVIII. 17-18.

AHAB. Art *thou* he that troubleth Israel?

ELIJAH. *I* have not troubled Israel; but *thou* and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim.

MORAL. It is not those who warn against or expose a nation's evil doings, that trouble her quiet; but those who *do* the evil, and those who keep still, when it *is* done.

DISCOURSE.

PROV. 22: 28. REMOVE NOT THE ANCIENT LANDMARK, WHICH THY FATHERS HAVE SET.

This is a warning against a crime to which there is always some temptation. But in the country where it was given, the temptation was unusually open and great, because there were no fences, and stones set up were the only landmarks to go by.

From the earliest times the changing of landmarks seems to have been regarded as especially criminal. This probably was owing to the antiquity of agriculture, and because an offence of this kind could only be committed in a settled community, where strife would thus be engendered and perpetuated. At the present day, superstition makes the commission of this crime so great, that in expiation of the guilt, the ghost of the transgressor is compelled to wander for a hundred years along the disputed line. And when we consider the proverbially long and exasperating nature of a land suit, we can understand the fitness of the heavy penalty which superstition imposes and the high importance of the injunction: "Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set."

The present proceedings of our National Legislature, bring forcibly to mind the words of the text. Our fathers in the opening youth of our country, set up certain landmarks, which were to separate between the lands of the oppressor and his oppressed, and the territory of freedom. But, as in the division of Canaan the children of Joseph soon came to Joshua and complained that "one lot and one portion" were not enough; so the slave power, shortly after we had been apportioned and the

landmarks fixed in our political Canaan, complained that it was straitened ; and our government replied like Joshua—" If thou be a great people, then get thee up to the wood country, cut down for thyself there in the land of the Perizzites and of the giants." Upon such permission the landmarks, which had not yet grown fast to their places, were taken up and set on the western border of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi. Now the waters of the great river, gathered from the free lands of the North, flowed about these landmarks, and men thought these landmarks would soon be so rooted and grounded in their places, that no one would or could pluck them up and remove them. But again Ephraim and Manasseh felt straitened and again the landmarks must come up, to be temporarily located on the western limits of Louisiana, Missouri, and Arkansas. Now at length the recreant North was aroused, and the controversy between slavery and freedom adjusted by consecrating all territory north of $36^{\circ}30'$, to a perpetual freedom.

Here then were set up the landmarks of freedom by our fathers. It was a solemn compact. The Goddess of Liberty dropped a tear as she looked on the *southern* side of that stone, but her face lighted up as she thought that at length *her* children would have a fixed habitation. Years rolled on ; the boundaries remained inviolate ; the stones thereof grew fast in the undisturbed soil, and though cupidity rested not until Texas was annexed, and its free soil opened to bondage, nor until Mexico yielded to our superior skill — still the line $36^{\circ}30'$ was an impassable barrier ; against its sacred walls the tide of slavery rolled, and at its base died away. Even the fierce conflict between the free and the slave states, which in 1850 imposed upon the derelict North, the inhuman, brutalizing Fugitive Slave Law, carefully abstained from the sacred line agreed upon in 1820. But in this 1854th year of grace, what do we see ? Why this same spirit of bondage — North and South, bargaining—no conspiring to pull up the ancient landmarks which our fathers have set, under the Jesuitical plea, that they were shaken loose in 1850, and have ever since been lying

useless upon the ground. And where do they now intend to set up these old landmarks? Will they next plant them on the barren crests of the Rocky Mountains, and allow them a precarious situation there? *No*. Will you then carry them down to the great sea, that the waters of oriental despotism may lave the one side, and the waves of American oppression beat against the other? *No*! says the high priest of this iniquity, we will take these landmarks; these stones which our patriotic and philanthropic fathers set up—these humane monuments builded by Washington, Jefferson and Adams, we'll take them and grind them to powder, and scatter them upon the air, as did the Council of Constance the ashes of Huss and Jerome, so that the dust even of the heresy of freedom and equal rights, shall be destroyed in this land. I say to these priests of oppression, beware, lest this dust, like the ashes in the hand of Moses become “a boil breaking forth with blains, upon man and upon beast, throughout all this land,” because the Lord of Hosts has heard the groanings of the bondmen and bondwomen in our Egypt.

But, my friends, it is not my purpose to gratify any party, by dwelling upon the political aspects of this question. My commission dates from a higher authority than political parties; and I trust, I shall be able to call your attention and awaken your conscience, to a higher class of motives than it is deemed proper or expedient for politicians to urge on this vexed question of Nebraska.

This bill is iniquitous, in the first place, because it legislates for the extension, and perpetuation, and consolidation of wrong.

Now I cannot long detain myself in attempting to prove that the slave system is wrong. You do not expect me, my Christian friends, to prove from the Bible the iniquity of a system, which even heathen chieftains in the centre of Africa condemn. Do you ask me to prove that selling men and women like cattle, is wrong? Do you need to be told that unrequited toil is wrong? Do you expect me to show that denying and violating the marriage ordinance is not right? Or do you call

upon me to show that any one or all of these evils, in the hands of selfish men, can be any thing but wrong?

But says one, *slavery in the abstract*, is not wrong. This may be, but where, except in the fancies of these apologists for evil, is slavery in the abstract found? Is whipping women and children to death, slavery in the abstract? Is hunting down fugitives with blood-hounds, slavery in the abstract? Is selling households to the four quarters of the globe, slavery in the abstract? Shame on the man who apologizes for a system which never can and never did exist as an abstraction, except in metaphysical speculation. I might as well defend intemperance in the abstract. Surely there is no harm in selling poison, any more than in selling bread, and abstractly considered, there is no more sin in taking poison than in taking bread. Why then rail against the rum traffic, so innocent in the abstract? Is it not, my hearers, because you never meet with this curse except in the concrete? You find it in disease, poverty, crime and death. You find it in violated purity, in ruined character, and in ruined souls.

But says our humane slave advocate—" *cannot Slavery exist on Christian principles?*" Our reply is that the Church used to burn dissenting men and women on Christian principles, and that too, without suspecting that an Auto de Fe strained the quality of their logic, any more than it strained the quality of their mercy. No, but says our opponent, did not the Bible regulate slavery, and does not that prove that it is not sinful? We reply, did it not regulate polygamy too—and also war? Why then not wage war on Christian principles, as is the practice of the Russian autocrat, and as is stipulated for in our treaty with Mexico?—and why not practice polygamy in the same way, as is the custom with our Mormon brethren?

But say some religious journals and Christian preachers, *if Abraham could be a slave-holder, and yet be a good man, why may not a Legree be a slave-holder and a Christian?* I will also put a question, and perhaps when they have answered my question, they can answer their own. If Abraham could be a polyga-

mist, and yet be a good man, why may not Brigham Young be a polygamist and still a good man; and why may not any man be a polygamist, and yet a good man? The fallacy of their reasoning is here. They suppose this regulation of slavery, in the Scriptures, to be for the approbation and preservation of the institution; whereas, it is for the condemnation and abolition of the system. If they do not believe this, let them try it, and if, in the faithful observance of these Bible principles, there remains a slave in this country after a quarter of a century, I'll venture to say there will no sane man be found in the ranks of anti-slavery. Fill the Salt Lake and the South with Abrahams, and in another generation, neither bondage nor polygamy, will defile or curse our borders.

If then the slave power, when entrusted to selfish men, is so monstrous an infringement on human rights, how cautious should the friends of freedom and Christianity be, lest its abominations should extend themselves beyond their present limits. Now just follow me in the history of this system since the adoption of our federal Constitution. In 1790, there were in the United States, 697,897 slaves; now there are more than three millions and a quarter. As many slaves are now held in bondage by us, as the entire population of our country, when we declared our independence. If England had made every American a slave in 1776, she would not have held as many slaves in these United States, as free, independent and glorious America holds to-day.

But look at another fact. In 1850, the Slave Territory covered 900,000 square miles; in 1787 it covered only 268,000. In 1787 there were not 100,000 bondmen outside of the original slave states; and in 1850 there were more than a million and a half.

Now I ask Christian men to stop and reflect, whether it is desirable to throw open any more territory to the advantage and advancement of this institution? Of the territory belonging to the United States, not quite one half is organized into States. More than 1,600,000 square miles yet remain, and it

is proposed by our Congress, to remove every obstacle, and to present every inducement for the slave power to enter into competition with freedom, for this vast area—an area more than forty times as large as Ohio.* We ask again is it just, is it patriotic, is it Christian, to do such an act?

Having shown how slavery has extended itself from a hand-breadth to the size of a kingdom, and knowing its aggressive character, shall we expose this large heritage of freedom to its further invasion? Shall we say, in effect, that we declared all men free and independent in order to open 3,000,000 square miles to certain and endless oppression? God forbid that we should use our freedom as a shield and a sword in favor of slavery. If this is henceforth to be our country's mission, then obliterate from our flags the stars of heaven, and let the symbolic stripes cover its flaunting folds.

But the measure now before Congress not only opens a wide door of aggression, but it wants to open it so that no man can shut it. It proposes to offer facilities for the indefinite extension of slavery, and to provide guarantees for its perpetual duration.

Immediately after the declaration of Independence, when the spirit of freedom yet burned in our bosoms, all the New England States, and all the Middle States, abolished slavery; but since that time, not a single State has followed the humane example.† But why did not others? First, it was soon found that slavery offered great political advantages. Every slave was three-fifths of a man when it came to election days; but on all

	Square Miles.
*New Mexico,	119,774
Kansas,	187,181
Minnesota,	83,000
Oregon and Washington,	341,468
Utah,	187,923
Nebraska,	724,264
	<hr/>
	1,643,710

†Vermont abolished slavery by Constitution 1777; Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, (including the District of Maine,) 1780; Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island, 1784; New York, 1799; New Jersey, 1804. During the first twenty years after the Declaration of Independence, nine States abolished slavery. During the last fifty, not one; while during these fifty years, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Missouri, Arkansas, Florida, and Texas, have come in with slavery.

other days he was only a piece of flesh, worth so much in the shambles. Now this franchise pertained to women as well as children ; so that though a negro is, according to the Constitution, two-fifths less than a white man, he is by solemn compact, three-fifths more than either a white woman at any age, or a white man under 21 years of age.

Now suppose officers to be increased by this representation, as they are ; and suppose monies to be divided on the same basis, as was done in 1832, and all other political considerations in the same way ; is it strange that the Southern States do not abolish or restrict slavery ? Is it because the people South of Mason and Dixon's line are worse than we are ? Not at all. Most of us and most of our politicians, would do just as they do. Just think of it. The State of Ohio sends twenty-one Representatives to Congress, for its 2,000,000 freemen, and the South sends the same number for its 3,000,000 slaves, thus gaining two Representatives in each slave state, and 20 votes in the National Legislature. Surely, they need not be very selfish, to wish and strive to perpetuate and extend an institution which has such advantages. You would not expect a Legislature of gamblers to pass very stringent laws against lotteries or mock auctions ; or a body of distillers to be very hard on grog shops. Well, slave-holding politicians South, and slave-holding politicians North, act on similar principles. And further, every slave state, as soon as admitted, has two Senators, whose votes are equal to any two Senators of Ohio, New York, or Pennsylvania ; and with these votes lies the power of confirming foreign ministers, collectors, United States Judges, and a score of other officers, and think you slavery will neglect and refuse to improve such advantages ?

But there is another reason why slavery will be extended and perpetuated by this bill. Slavery exhausts the land — it kills itself out ; it cannot breathe its own atmosphere more than 100 years. This is proved from the fact that the staple products of all the old slave states have already begun to fall off. Now shut up slavery to a limited territory and it dies of atrophy

and wastes away with consumption ; but give it fresh air, a wider range, and a virgin soil, and it revives and strengthens again. Now I ask is not this just what was accomplished by the annexation of Texas and the war with Mexico ? Is it not to provide against suffocation, that the present bill proposes to demolish ancient barriers and let it revive and nourish itself for centuries to come, on this acquired territory of a million and a half of square miles ?

It humbles me as a freeman to think that many now in this house, shall live to see the day when, if the policy of our present administration should prevail, there will be 15,000,000 slaves in the United States.* And when I think of it as a Christian, my heart bleeds for the sons and daughters of bondage, held in a *free* land, and with the concurrence of a *Christian people*. Merciful God ! shall it be that oppression shall thus prevail, and that churches and pastors shall not only apologise for the wrong, but shall wrest scripture and reason to the defense and sanctification of the wrong ?

The past history and present spirit of the slave power, clearly show that it is aggressive and will never rest satisfied, so long as a pretext for further extension presents itself, or the least hope of perpetuity offers. I now propose to show that it tends towards consolidation, and that the bill before Congress is designed to offer it every facility.

* The following table will show that this statement contains no exaggeration :

				Slaves.			
In 1790,	-	-	-	697,897			
" 1800,	-	-	-	893,041	Increase,	195,144	- - 28 per ct.
" 1810,	-	-	-	1,181,364	"	298,323	- - 33 "
" 1820,	-	-	-	1,538,064	"	346,700	- - 29 "
" 1830,	-	-	-	2,009,031	"	470,967	- - 31 "
" 1840,	-	-	-	2,487,355	"	478,324	- - 24 "
" 1850,	-	-	-	3,204,321	"	716,966	- - 29 "
" 1860,	-	-	-	4,145,982	"	941,661	- - 29-2 "
" 1870,	-	-	-	5,356,608	"	1,210,626	- - " "
" 1880,	-	-	-	6,920,737	"	1,564,129	- - " "
" 1890,	-	-	-	8,943,592	"	2,022,855	- - " "
" 1900,	-	-	-	11,555,120	"	2,611,528	- - " "
" 1910,	-	-	-	14,929,215	"	3,374,095	- - " "

It does so, in the first place, by enlarging the domain of slavery. There are many things which must become large to become influential; and such is the nature of this principle, that even wrongs lose their hideous character, when full grown. For example: when one man enters and robs his neighbor's house, he is a burglar and condemned to the State's Prison. He is disgraced and shunned, and never can become respectable, or render his profession so, until he enlarges his operations. But when five hundred men sail from New York to commit burglary in Cuba, and two hundred and fifty steal away from California to rob helpless Mexico, the business becomes so respectable, that one administration is condemned for issuing a proclamation against them, and another is reluctantly prompt in issuing a second. If *one man* had entered Sonora to rob and murder, he would have been caught, imprisoned, and hung; but two hundred make robbery respectable, heroic, and patriotic. If Alexander killed his friend Clitus, he is a murderer, dishonored and hated; but when tens of thousands of Persians strew his ambitious path to empire, he is celebrated as the greatest conqueror whom the world has ever seen. Napoleon will perhaps never outlive the infamy of his supposed cruelty towards the prisoners of Jaffa; while his bloody purposes which cost France a million of men, and his enemies an equal number, are the theme of every Bonapartist, from Thiers down to the Rev. Mr. Abbott. You see how virtuous great crimes become and what heroes great criminals may make. The oppression which disgraces Naples, is honorable in the U. States, and when slavery shall cover 1,500,000 square miles and number 15,000,000 subjects, thousands will fall down before it and cry out "Great is Southern Slavery"—"Great is American oppression," who, if Delaware and Rhode Island alone held slaves, would make them a by-word and a proverb, and a hissing to the nations of the earth.

But again, oppressive institutions are consolidated by time itself. As a stone, left to its own weight, will finally fasten itself upon the earth, so tyranny left to its own heaviness, will grow fast in society, and at last crush out every principle of

freedom. It is now two hundred and thirty-five years since slavery began in this country, and who does not know that it is more difficult to eradicate it now, than when its roots were not yet set and its fibres not yet entwined about the columns and corner-stones of our political edifice? But during these years slavery has not only put gyves and manacles on the slave, it has also put a bond on the southern mind. The social institutions of the slave states, have taken a mould from this system; manners and customs have grown up with it; laws and institutions have taken their tinge and order from it, and prejudice and pride have been fostered by it. Hence, when you touch the southern body politic on this subject, you immediately excite the whole system. The nerves of this spirit of bondage pervade and render sensitive every member, and ward off every approach of inquiry or danger.

There is yet one more reflection on this subject. Extension and perpetuation of the slave system, consolidate its power by offering temptations of place and power to northern politicians. In our politics, the slave power has always moved to the conflict with the steady, heavy tread of the Macedonian phalanx; while the forces of freedom have straggled to the field, with the uncertainty and inefficiency of Indians or Bedouins. And where, in a Presidential election, did not victory perch on her banner? Is it not notorious, that a Presidential candidate must either be born south, or bred *for the South*—and renegades are better for treason than native born, just as Benedict Arnold was worth more to England than even a true Englishman. My hearers, the maxim of Walpole is too true, “every man has his price,” and the Presidential chair is a great price for services rendered. Every newspaper has its price, and our secular and religious journals are in danger of being feed to blind their eyes to the right. Every body has its price, and our churches, for numbers sake, have found oppression sanctioned and sanctified in the Bible. Ah! the magic of these bribes! I sometimes think—I cannot help it—that the great oak whose strength was nurtured by the winds of New Hampshire and Massachusetts, for three-score and ten years, did in his last days, bend a little

towards this power of bondage. I hope it was not so—but if it was, what wonder that a sapling from the same region should bow to the ground before it, and that the exotics of Michigan and Illinois, should sway towards the same mighty spirit?

Having shown that the political question now before Congress was an iniquitous measure, because it legislated for the *extension, perpetuation and consolidation of wrong*, I propose further to show that it is iniquitous, because it proposes to legislate as if *right and wrong were the same thing, and had the same rights*.

In the first place, this bill violates the immutable distinction between right and wrong, by proposing to give them both an equal chance to enter and possess the territories of the United States. Our text warns against removing the ancient landmarks in general, and those who oppose the present measure, put their opposition on the same ground; but I think the Christian must place his protest on a higher basis—for while he may urge the obligations of the Missouri Compromise on grounds of honor and courtesy, he cannot be supposed, if slavery is wrong, to approve of the principles of that compact. Right and wrong admit of no compromise. Every compromise in the domain of ethics, is treason, or dereliction; and such was the Missouri Compromise, and such too the compromise of 1850. A man has no right to enter into alliances of fraud or oppression for the sake of securing some good result. And, in morals, the rights of a nation are no greater than the rights of the individuals of that nation. The friends of freedom had a right to demand the cessation of the slave trade in the District of Columbia, but they had no right to offer every constructive guarantee of the constitution for the lawless extradition of the fugitive from bondage. They had a right to contend for the free admission of California, but they had no right in lieu of such condition, to consent to the pro-slavery clauses of Utah and New Mexico.

The Christian then must come back to the indestructible basis of right, and on this, must his opposition be founded. Now, observing the ineffaceable and divine distinction between right and wrong, how can any good man vote in favor of giving

them an equal chance? Is government organized to see that right and wrong have fair play; that virtue and vice shall have an equal start, and that freedom and slavery may not enter on an unequal contest? We are taught by God that government is of divine institution; but are we to understand that it is a divine ordinance for oppression; a divine contrivance to see that iniquity is not jostled by righteousness in the conflict for ascendancy? Such cannot be the ordinance of a good being. I have been taught, that though government is necessitated by sin and is the creature of such necessity, yet I never understood it to be the duty or right of government, to legislate for wrong, or to preserve the balance of power between right and wrong. I understand the duty of government to be to legislate for God and decree statutes for humanity.

Now, on our western borders, are a million of square miles of territory. It is God's territory by creation. On that territory he looked, when he said "behold all things are good." That benediction has rested on it for 6000 years. *I think it was free soil.* I don't think the Almighty ever created any slave territory. It remained for free America, not only to amend this first charter of free soil; but having created slavery, also to repeal this charter of the Almighty, and invite oppression to a new and a larger home.

Reverting to our fundamental positions that the earth was a *free* gift to *free* men, and that governments are instituted for the preservation, perpetuation, and if need be, the vindication of these first principles; can we look with indifference on the slightest perversion of, or aggression on them? Are Christians to look with apathy at a monstrous invasion on free territory, by any system of oppression? And shall the minister of God, appointed to watch for the character and rights of God, shut his eyes and ears, and harden or stupify his heart, until wrong triumphs, and then apologize for it, or sluggishly pray for its removal, when in the eternal providence of God, it shall seem best?

But leaving this more abstract ground, let me come nearer to

you, and show you, that you ought not, and do not think, that right and wrong are equally entitled to encouragement, protection and defense. Suppose the city of Cleveland held the perpetual lease of one thousand of the best building lots in the city, having exclusive control. Now suppose further, that all the gamblers, pickpockets, burglars, thieves, drunkards, rowdies and prostitutes of New York, Philadelphia, New Orleans, and Baltimore, should leave those cities and come to Cleveland; and suppose further still, that ten thousand honest merchants, mechanics, artists, and day laborers, should come from the same places, and that both parties should apply at the same time to the City Council for the occupancy of those lots; and still further suppose that the City Council had many years ago, promised, and all these outcasts and out-laws had agreed to it, that those eligible lots should never be rented, leased or sold, to any outcasts, or out-laws forever, but should be reserved for honest tradesmen, would you approve of your city authorities if they paid no regard to the character of those applicants and trampled upon the old agreement to exclude these reprobates? Would you approve of them, if in the face of all these things, they not only leased, rented, and sold these lots to such reprobates, but leased, sold, and rented them on easier terms than to their honest competitors? I know you would not; but in the outburst of your honest indignation and outraged virtue you would sweep the recreant authorities from the face of your city. You would scorn them as traitors and hold up their evil names to everlasting shame. Is not this a parable of the present demand made by the slave power? A territory forty times as large as Ohio, is possessed by the United States. All of it is free by creation, and most of it by ancient compact between the free and slave states. But it is now proposed, by the government, to throw this land open to the ingress of freedom and slavery, with a considerable bonus to the slave power. This power as is its wont, will carry men, women and children into that country for merchandize. Slave marts will be doubly active in

Georgia, Louisiana, and Virginia,* to supply these lands. All over the acquired territory, the emblems of Southern civilization ; the auction block and the whipping posts, will be set up ; at which human flesh is to be sold and whipped, and female modesty and virtue bartered and destroyed. On the banks of those free rivers, slave parents will weep for their slave offspring in South Carolina and Kentucky ; and beneath the lash of the overseer, the wife will sigh for her husband in Florida, and the husband will pray for his wife in Texas ; and if under such provocations, the poor bondman's spirit rises with indignation against his oppressor, he shall be shot down, or seized by a furious mob, be nailed up and burned alive. Should he take refuge in flight, blood-hounds with their congenial masters, will hunt him down like a beast of prey, and tear piecemeal his life out of him. Or if, perchance, he hath heard of the free North, since 1850, free no longer, and like a hero, flees for its uncertain border—the Fugitive Slave Law, then extended along a

* “ In the Legislature of this State, in 1832, Thomas Jefferson Randolph declared that Virginia had been converted into ‘one grand menagerie, where men are reared for the market like oxen for the shambles.’ This same gentleman thus compared the foreign with the domestic traffic. ‘The trader (African) receives the slaves, a stranger in aspect, language, and manner, from the merchant who brought him from the interior. But *here* sir, individuals whom the master has known from infancy—whom he has seen sporting in the innocent gambols of childhood—who have been accustomed to look to him for protection, he tears from the mother's arms, and sells into a strange country—among a strange people—subject to cruel taskmasters. In my opinion, it is much worse.’

“ Mr. Gholson, of Virginia, in his speech in the Legislature of that State, January 18, 1831, (see Richmond Whig,) says : ‘The legal maxim of *partus sequitur ventrem* is coeval with the existence of the rights of property itself, and is founded in wisdom and justice. It is only on the justice and inviolability of the maxim, that the master foregoes the service of the female slave, has her nursed and attended during the period of her gestation, and raises the helpless and innocent offspring. The value of the property justifies the expense ; and I do not hesitate to say that *in its increase consists much of our wealth.*’

“ Professor Dew, now President of the College of William and Mary, Virginia, in his review of the debate in the Virginia Legislature in 1831-32, speaking of the revenue arising from the trade, says : ‘A full equivalent being thus left in the place of the slave, this emigration becomes an advantage to the State, and does not check the black population as much as at first view we might imagine, because it furnishes every inducement to the master to attend to the negroes, to *encourage breeding*, and to *cause the greatest number possible to be raised.* Virginia is, in fact, a *negro raising State for other States.*’

“ Mr. C. F. Mercer asserted in the Virginia Convention of 1829 : “The tables of the natural growth of the slave population demonstrate, when compared with the increase of its numbers in the Commonwealth for twenty years past, that an annual revenue of not less than “a million and a half of dollars,” is derived from the *exportation* of a part of this population.’ ”

line of 3000 miles shall hover over the fugitive like a cormorant and seizing its timid prey, shall bear it back to hopeless bondage. Such is the practical issue. Now, I ask, shall such a system have an equal or a better chance than a humane one? We say let no more upas trees be planted on free soil, to blight with disease or blast with death, every economic interest, every political relation, every domestic charity, every religious sanctity. Let this Egyptian Elephantiasis, this black leprosy, be confined to its infected districts, as fixed by compact, and let no clean person meddle with it, but by prayer, until God's providence shall make it safe for humane men to go within the plague limits and minister relief to the decaying mass.

Let us next briefly consider the reason urged for such an iniquitous privilege. *It is equal rights and self-government.* But if this plea is good for slavery, then it is good for intemperance. If the slave power can claim exemption from legislative interference, then can polygamy; and yet what would you say to the United States government legislating polygamy and intemperance into territories on the plea of equal rights and self-government? The simple truth is drunkenness, licentiousness and slavery, are all wrong; and *the only right that wrong has is to be restrained, punished and abolished.* I know this principle of equal rights and self-government is a great democratic principle, applicable to all, but people of a darker complexion. Some men love it and shout for it because it is found in the Declaration of Independence; I love it, and preach it, because it is found in the Bible, because it is implied in the Atonement, because it is vindicated by the Holy Ghost. But neither the Holy Spirit, nor Jesus Christ, nor the Gospel of God, ever taught or countenanced the infamous sentiment, that equal rights and self-government belong to virtue and wickedness alike; or that polygamy and slavery should have the same chartered privileges that are granted to purity and freedom. Self-government is a privilege, but humanity is a duty; and who does not know that charity is nobler than justice, and that the right to enjoy a privilege, must yield to the obligation of

doing right? I know that this principle of self-rule and equality, as urged in this bill, is a lie, and you know it is a lie, and yet it is so specious that many good men will be entrapped by it and will approve of the Nebraska measures. But let me here say, that I do not believe, that there is a single Congressman who does not know better; who does not know that wrong is an outlaw, and as such, has no rights at all. Why just carry out this infernal logic and what shall prevent Satan and his legions on the principles of equal rights and self-rule, to contend with the saints of earth for the unoccupied territory of Heaven? No one will disparage their ability for self-government, or presume to say that their occupancy of the free seats of Heaven is not as constitutional, as is the occupancy of enfranchised territory, by the slave power. No doubt they think the larger privileges of the saints to be very unconstitutional, just as our slave advocates find the privileges of freedom in the territories, very unconstitutional. But as for us, we rejoice exceedingly, that in Heaven nothing is constitutional but what is right; and we further say, that if in our government nothing be constitutional but slavery, and every thing interfering with this very peculiar institution, be unconstitutional, then the sooner we get rid of either slavery or the constitution, or both, the better. Rather than lie on this short couch and under this same straitened cover any longer, let us rend them in pieces and get a bed long enough for a freeman to stretch himself on it, and a covering wide enough to wrap himself in it.

When I saw how the slave power was tampering with freedom and read the congratulation tendered the Senate, by the Hon. member from Michigan, I could not help recal the following lines from the blind author of *Paradise Lost*, and almost believe that his liberty-loving soul intended them as an allegory of this doctrine of "squatter sovereignty:"

* * * " Satan there they found,
Squat like a toad, close at the ear of Eve,
 Assaying by his devilish art to reach
 The organs of her fancy, and with them forge

Illusions as he list, *phantasms*, and *dreams* ;
 Or if, inspiring verom, he might taint
 Th' animal spirits that from pure blood arise
 Like gentle breaths from rivers pure, thence raise
 At least distempered discontented thoughts,
Vain hopes, vain aims, inordinate desires,
 Blown up with high conceits, engendering pride.

Paradise Lost, Lib. iv. 799—809.

Satan represents the slave power—Eve is the pure spirit of liberty, and the “illusions, phantasms, dreams, the vain hopes, vain aims, &c.” are they not the place and power of government, the honors and emoluments of office, which this measure now holds out in prospect, and if successful, promises to its advocates? But as the spear of Ithuriel discovered the great enemy of our race under the guise of a harmless reptile, so will truth, faithfully presented, reveal the vilest monster of iniquity and oppression beneath the honied terms and specious pretensions of self-rule, and equal rights, as held by the advocates of this bill. But if any candid mind still believes that the great democratic principle of self-government, is the basis of this bill, let him find an adequate reason for the domineering and overwhelming rejection of an amendment offered to secure that very end.*

*“SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That, as soon as may be, after the passage of this act, there shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, three commissioners, resident in said Territory, who, or a majority of them, shall proceed to divide said Territory into suitable election precincts, and shall appoint places for holding elections therein: and by proclamation published in two or more newspapers circulating in said Territory, and by such other means as they may deem most effectual for the purpose, shall during four weeks preceding the first Monday of September, 1854, notify the people of said Territory of such division and appointment, and that there will be held, on the second Tuesday of October, 1854, an election for Governor, secretaries, judges, members of the Council, members of the House of Representatives, and Delegate in Congress, of said Territory, as hereinafter provided; and the voters of said Territory, in pursuance of said proclamation, are hereby authorized to assemble at their respective places of election within their several election precincts, and appoint one person to act as judge and another person to act as clerk of the election, and then to vote by ballot for one person to be Governor, one person to be secretary, three persons to be judges, thirteen persons to be members of the Council, twenty-six persons to be members of the House of Representatives, and one person to be Delegate in Congress, of said Territory; and the judges and clerks of election in the several precincts shall forthwith make out and transmit to the commissioners aforesaid a correct statement of the names and number of electors, and of the votes cast for each candidate for the several offices aforesaid, and the said commissioners, or a majority of them, shall, within ten days after the first Monday of December, 1854, issue their proclamation announcing the result of said election, and shall notify the several persons having respectively the highest number of votes for the several offices aforesaid, of

Again, if the slave power north and south shall be permitted to perpetrate this great fraud upon freedom, this unspeakable wrong on humanity, and still our consciences slumber, who can say to what further enormities such moral lethargy may not expose us? If the demand for Nebraska is acceded to, what shall prevent this insatiable and unscrupulous power from demanding Cuba or Hayti, or the Sandwich Islands? Nay, what shall keep it finally from the free States themselves? And if Ohio and Massachusetts, and New York, and their free sisters, through pulpit, press, and political action help to consummate the present outrage on Nebraska—are they not themselves fit prizes for future slave aggressions? If free Christian states persistently fasten this political vampire on territory, as free as their own, who shall give a guarantee that this murky monster shall not, at last, suck their own life-blood? After assiduously fastening the shackles for seventy years, on the increasing millions of unoffending men and women, in the South,—what if God should say, “Ye recreant freemen, ye hypocritical Christians, ye hunters of human beings, ye are not worthy of either freedom or religion—be ye also slaves and drink the cup which ye helped press to other lips—drink it to the dregs—then shall ye know whether slavery is wrong; then shall ye know whether extending, fostering and consolidating it is wrong.” What a terrible school would this be in which to learn justice, humanity, and abolition.

their election to fill the same, and shall also, in said proclamation, designate a place for the temporary seat of Government of said Territory, and a time not later than the first day of May, 1855, for the assembling of the Legislature thereof; and the Governor so elected shall hold his office for two years from the first Monday of December, 1854, and shall reside therein; shall be commander-in-chief of the militia thereof; may grant pardons and respites for offences against the laws of said Territory, and reprieves for offences against the laws of the United States, until the decision of the President in respect thereof can be made known; shall commission all officers who shall be appointed to office under the laws of said Territory, and shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed therein.”

The question was taken, by yeas and nays, on the amendment, with the following result:

YEAS—Messrs. Chase, Fessenden, Foot, Hamlin, Norris, Seward, Shields, Smith, Sumner, and Wade—10.

NAYS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Benjamin, Brodhead, Brown, Butler, Clay, Dawson, Dixon, Dodge of Wisconsin, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Evans, Fitzpatrick, Gwin, Houston, Hunter, Johnson, Jones of Iowa, Jones of Tennessee, Mason, Morton, Pettit, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Slidell, Stuart, and Williams—30.

When I think of the present position of our country, I tremble. We are sinners in this matter above all others—we are behind the miscreant Napoleon III., and Italy, the ecclesiastical bond-house. Spain, that old skeleton oppressor, and her shrivelled sister Portugal, put us to blush. Austria, the despoiler of Hungary, owns not a pound of slave flesh. Infidel Turkey, at once the scorn and dread of Christianity, is our superior; and while the Bey of Tunis declares that “all slaves who enter his territory by land and sea, shall be free,” the United States constitutes commissioners of the North, and all Christian citizens under penalty of fine or imprisonment, a band of slave hounds to scent out, hunt down and seize their human prey panting for freedom. Now I ask you, my Christian hearers and fellow-citizens, can we any longer consent to the extension of slavery? As Sodom and Gomorrah, Tyre and Sidon shall rise up against unbelieving scribes and pharisees, for slighting Christ’s message—so shall Spain and Italy, Austria and France, Portugal and Turkey—unbelieving Tunis, and Pagan India, rise up against us in judgment, if we abet this inhuman outrage—an outrage destined to doom millions of human beings to a worse than Algerine bondage?

I have always been opposed to slavery. I believe every thinking man is, whether North or South. Hitherto I consented to leave it unmolested, within its constitutional limits. I was opposed to it there; but the laws of the State threw it beyond my lawful interference. I could only *pray* for its abolition. I did pray for its abolition; I will do so still. So long as it confined itself to unfortunately—criminally conceded limits, I could do no more; I did no more. But when I see this curse escaping from the Carolinas and Georgia, and fastening its fatal mark on lands where the free signet of God’s franchise had first to be effaced, I think my duty changed. I think every christian’s did. When I discerned that it was not only contagious but aggressive, I said this must not be; and now, at length, this measure which, in iniquity, transcends all former measures, has sealed my resolution, *to have no compromise with it.* We

have warmed the viper in the bosom of the constitution, and now it turns and stings to death, freedom, humanity and kindness. We have hatched this crocodile in the sands of the South, and now it wastes and desolates the lands of the North. May God judge between us—but we *cannot*, christians! we *dare not*, approve this measure.

In conclusion, then, what shall we do? A distinguished doctor of divinity says, “leave it to the eternal providence of God.” This sounds very pious; but it is a very lazy piety—nay, an impious piety. Why not leave all crime and violence to this pains-taking Providence? If it can take care of slavery, it can take care of murder. If of murder, then of robbery, and of drunkenness, and uncleanness, and all sin. What an easy religion ours would be. We should want neither Bible, nor preachers, nor churches, nor theology—least of all, doctors of divinity—for surely the Turk leaves all things as submissively to the eternal Providence as the most easy-minded doctor of divinity could wish. Away with such christianity, it is worth no more in religion than in farming—and in farming, without plowing, harrowing and sowing, it is worth nothing. Ah! but say these men, you must *pray for the slave*. Was such the course recommended by James when a brother or sister is hungry or naked? *Pray* that they may have food and clothing, or at least may not feel the pangs of hunger and the pinchings of cold, and will that warm and satisfy? Pray against slavery, but open the territories, and will that keep it out? No, christians, you have no right to leave anything to Providence, which you can do. You have no right or command to pray for anything which you can do. Prayer against evil begins where work against it ceases, and not before. It may be right enough to pray against this sin in South Carolina, but you have no business to pray against it in Nebraska. No! no business, till you can't prevent it from entering there. Your necessity, not your indolence, is God's opportunity. The following is the only consistent prayer for those who leave everything to the eternal Providence, and is found in all pro-slavery liturgies:

“Lord we bless thee for our mercies of freedom and happiness, and would submissively remember the slave and commend his sufferings to thy care. May the divine institution of slavery ever be under thy watch and care and be greatly prospered. If consistent make all men of our mind, lovers of quiet, and subject to the powers that be. May we have grace enough to look with approbation on the bondage of those men and women, seeing they have upon them the mark of Ham and have wisely been declared to be the servants of Japheth forever, and Thou knowest, oh Lord! we are Japheth. Especially grant success to the Fugitive Slave Law—raise up many Nimrods—mighty slave hunters before the Lord. Stay the tongues and enlighten the consciences of those deluded men, who at this time, seek not the peace of the land, but seek to oppose Thy providence in planting this patriarchal institution on all our western borders; and thus may all good men pray, till it shall please Thee, in thine eternal Providence to restore the descendants of Ham to their forfeited liberties and original manhood. Amen.”

Is this a prayer that will break every yoke and let the oppressed go free? Pray against slavery and vote for Nebraska. Introduce, extend and perpetuate bondage, and throw the abolition on the Almighty!

What then shall you do? First, you must look at this question in a moral, not a political, light. You must be something more and better than mere Whigs or Democrats or Free Soilers. You must be friends of justice and humanity. Some people, I know, think a bad Democrat better than a good Whig, I think that neither bad Whigs, nor bad Democrats, nor, most of all, recreant Free Soilers, are good enough to act in the present emergency. We want the good men of all these parties to forget their party differences, and unite in one solemn, conscientious and decided protest against this ruthless demand of slavery.

In asking after your duty in this matter, don't ask whether slavery shall enter free territory, because you don't know what

slavery is. You have heard so much about slavery in the abstract, Hebrew slavery, Apostolic and Christian slavery, that you don't know what slavery is. *The slave alone knows what it is.* Always bear in mind when thinking about slaves, that they are men and women and children, husbands and wives, sons and daughters, fathers and mothers, even like yourselves. Think of these things and answer me, shall we have any more slave territory? If you can't say no, let me read for you a few "extracts from the American Slave Code :"

First, as to chattelship.—A slave—that is a man or woman—is one who is in the power of his master. The master may sell him, dispose of his *person*, his industry and his labor; he can possess nothing, nor acquire anything but what must belong to his master. Thus says Louisiana; and the same say her sister States.

Second, as to civil equality.—A slave for wilfully striking his master or mistress, or the child of either, or *his white overseer*, so as to cause a bruise or shedding of blood, *shall be punished with death.*

Third, as to civil justice.—No slave can be party in a civil suit; or witness in a civil or criminal matter, against any white person; nor in any case, except against negroes and mulattoes.*

Fourth, as respects education and religion.—For attempting, says Alabama, to teach any free colored person or slave to spell, read or write, a fine of not less than two hundred and fifty dollars nor more than five hundred dollars.

Ah, let them muffle the understandings and hearts of these human beings, but beware lest this blinded Sampson shall one day arise and in his eyeless rage, seizing the two columns of our Republic, North and South, shall pluck down this temple of Liberty, in ruins, on our heads!

*The late Miss Opie wrote a work on Lying, in which she speaks of "white lies," and we sometimes in common parlance speak of "black lies;" but it remained for the analytic powers of the slave legislation of our country, to graduate the oaths of witnesses on a chromatic scale according to the following spectrum: White, Mestizo, Quadroon, Mulatto, Sambo, Mangroon, Black. White, *prime*, Mulatto, *medium*, and Black, *zero*.

Fifth, on matrimony.---Slaves cannot contract matrimony. Explained thus by the Attorney General of Maryland:—"A slave is not admonished for incontinence, punished for adultery, nor prosecuted for bigamy."

After hearing these statutes, need I ask whether you are willing that the present landmarks of compact and compromises, set up by our fathers, and the eternal* landmarks of freedom and humanity set up by God, shall be removed? I say again, in answering this question don't ask whether "slaves" shall be carried into free territory. You are imposed on by the word "slaves." Ask whether men and women shall be carried there. Look at that helpless slave infant, and tell me whether such shall continue to be born with fetters, and bought and sold in Nebraska for beasts of burden? See that slave mother frantic over her last child, just doomed by the auctioneer's hammer to bondage in an unknown State, and answer me, shall such scenes be legislated into free Nebraska? Follow the timid fugitive to the swamp, hunted by dogs and demons, risking his life to the poisonous Mockeson or the slimy Alligator, and say are you willing such game shall be hunted in Nebraska? Behold that maiden fair as your own daughter, exposed to the brutality and lust of any purchaser, whom her fatal beauty may excite, and answer me ye Christian parents, will you support the opening of such markets on the virgin soil of Nebraska? Visit the rice and sugar fields of Georgia, walk along the blue banks of the Mobile, or steal through the cane brake of the Mississippi and see the tens of thousands of human beings legally embased; systematically degraded; knowledge, virtue, and piety under perpetual interdict, and tell me are you in favor of extending such civilization any further? See the pilgrim of freedom on his perilous journey north—now at bay in the river like a wolf—now tempting the floating ice, and now wrestling with the full tide of our beautiful Ohio, and answer me, shall

*The word translated "ancient" in the text, means eternal, and with this meaning how appropriate in the present instance.

the *stipulated* hunting ground of the Indian become the *constitutional* hunting ground of the slave power? Shall the savage red man and the grizzly bear, make room for the more savage white man and his human prey? If you are not willing that any or all these things should be extended, then answer *no*. Do it with an emphasis that shall ring in your consciences forever. Let your voices rise till their sound shall make every trading, truckling politician tremble. Let it fill the dome of the National Capitol with its acclaim. Let a Balaam press and a Balaam priesthood hear its indignant reverberations, and let the million freemen and christians North and South swell the chorus—No! No!! No!!! till the arches of heaven shall sweetly echo back the joyful sound.

